

A4R
8. L33
v. 2/6
copy 2



South Carolina House of Representatives

Legislative Update & Research Reports

Ramon Schwartz, Jr., Speaker of the House

Vol. 2

February 12, 1985

No. 6

CONTENTS

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

MAR 20 1985

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

STATE DOCUMENTS

Proposed Legislation.....1-2

Updating the *Update*: River Basin Map for
last issue's "Water Resource" Report.....1-6

SPECIAL REPORT

Budget Picture: Background.....2-1

RESEARCH REPORT

"Hazardous Waste and South Carolina" Review.....3-1

AROUND THE HOUSE

Sources and Resources for Black History Month.....3-1

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Room 324, Blatt Building, P.O. Box 11867, Columbia, S.C. 29211, [803] 758-5096

Legislative Update

Proposed Legislation

Consolidation & Annexation Bills

Consolidate. In a general sense, to unite into one mass or body, as to consolidate the forces of an army, or various funds.... The term means something more than to rearrange or redivide.

Annex. Derives from the Latin "annectere," meaning to tie or bind to. To attach, and often, specifically, to subjoin...

Annexation. The act of attaching, adding, joining or uniting one thing to another....So the incorporation of newly-acquired territory into the national domain, as an integral part thereof, is called "annexation," as in the case of the addition of Texas to the United States."

Black's Law Dictionary (Revised 4th Edition)

A series of bills relating to the general topics of annexation and government consolidation have been introduced into the House.

H.2281 would set procedures for consolidation of political subdivisions and even the creation of a single, county-wide government. A county governing body can create a "consolidated government charter commission" of 12 members--six appointed by the county, six chosen from the municipalities in the county according to population. The commission would conduct a study on consolidation, including at least three public hearings. The commission would draft a proposed consolidated government charter which could unite any and all subdivisions--except school districts, which must be left alone. Within 90 days of its completion the voters would have a chance to approve or reject this charter. If a majority in the county voted against the charter, it would fail; if the voters in the county seat or largest municipality voted against the charter, it would fail; if the majority of voters in another municipality voted against the proposal it would not take effect in that town or city.

Legislative Update, February 12, 1985

Three bills relating to annexation: H.2285 adjusts annexation procedures. At present a petition from an area asking to be annexed must be signed by 75% of the citizens owning 75% of the property in the area affected; this bill would reduce those percentages to 55%. A related bill, H.2286 would allow annexation to be initiated by resolution of the municipal council or petition signed by 25% of the freeholders in an area. H.2287 provides that when an election is held to decide on annexation only the area to be annexed needs to vote--no election would be required in the annexing municipality.

Other Government Operations

Constitutional amendments (H.2303, H.2305). The first of these bills would permit proposed constitutional amendments to be on the ballots only during elections when a governor is chosen. The second bill seeks to give the voters one last look at the pros and cons of a proposed amendment before they vote. At present, proposed amendments to the state Constitution appear on the ballot with a short explanation attached. This bill would require the Ballot Commission to prepare statements of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed amendment. This statement would be less than 100 words long; members of the General Assembly could make suggestions to the Commission on the wording and content of the statements.

Veteran's discharge (H.2347). Veteran benefits cannot be obtained until a certified copy of discharge is submitted to the Veterans' Administration. Currently the county Clerks of Court must certify the discharge; this bill would delegate that responsibility to the Veterans' Affairs Officer of each county, thus centralizing the process.

State Executive Personnel Review Committee (H.2358). Proposes the creation of the above committee to consist of the Governor (acting as Chairman), the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Chairs of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, and the Chairs of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees. The purpose of the committee is to determine whether an agency head should be fired. If the committee votes to discharge an agency head the board or commission of that agency can reinstate the head only by a two-thirds vote within 30 days of the action.

Crime & Justice

Contributory/Comparative negligence (H.2306). In the autumn of 1984 Judge Alex Sanders of the South Carolina Court of Appeals issued a ruling that allowed consideration of "comparative negligence" in assessing damage claims. Prior to that ruling state law held that if a person was in any way or to the slightest degree responsible for causing an accident he or she could not claim damages. The Court's ruling (and this bill) allow for the assessment of the comparative faults of the parties involved and the award of damages accordingly.

Legislative Update, February 12, 1985

No parole after 20 years (H.2329). Currently state law allows an inmate serving life for murder to be eligible for parole after 20 years; this would delete that provision.

One year sales tax for prisons (H.2333). This bill would raise the state sales tax by one penny for one year, with the proceeds to be ear-marked for new correctional institutions.

"Implied consent" and tests for DUI (H.2296, H.2356). Section 56-5-2950 of the Code is the "implied consent" clause, which means that if you drive a motor vehicle on the public highways in this state you thereby give your consent to submit to a chemical test to determine if you are driving under the influence. Refusal to submit to the test will result in suspension of your driver's license. And, the Attorney General has ruled: "Intentional failure to give enough air to be sampled constitutes a refusal."

H.2296 would allow for a preliminary screening test and, in addition, adds blood and or urine tests as covered under the implied consent provision. H.2356 defines the conditions for DUI, but repeals Section 56-5-2950.

Health & Safety

"Happy Hour" legislation (H.2317). A growing number of municipalities and states are enacting legislation to discourage or prohibit bars and saloons from using alcohol to encourage customers. This bill would forbid such practices as offering free drinks, selling two drinks for the price of one, special rates to certain groups ("Ladies' Nights," etc.), sale of beer by the pitcher to less than two persons, "double shots" (extra alcohol in a drink) and holding drinking contests.

Chiropractors/ Optometrists and insurance (H.2319, H.2331). The first bill would prohibit discrimination against chiropractors in payment of health insurance benefits; the second would do the same for optometrists.

Seat belts in school busses (H.2335, H.2339). The second of these two bills would require school busses to be equipped with seat belts; the first bill would require drivers and passengers to use them.

Environment & Energy

Hazardous waste disposal (H.2289). 75% of the waste buried in South Carolina is generated out of state. This bill addresses that problem by first encouraging alternative forms of disposal to land fills—incineration, recycling, etc. Second, it would provide for

greater state monitoring by requiring landfills to be on state-owned land (existing sites would be grandfathered-in). Disposal would be restricted to 50,000 tons per every 70 acres per year. Third, disposal fees for in-state waste would be raised from \$5 a ton to \$20 a ton; out-of-state waste fees would be raised from \$7.50 to \$30 per ton.

Please see the *Research Report* in this issue for more information on hazardous wastes in South Carolina.

"Nothing could be finer" (H.2322). Many states have mottoes on their license plates: "Illinois: Land of Lincoln," "You've Got a Friend in Pennsylvania," "Kansas: Flat but Fertile." This bill proposes South Carolina print "Nothing Could Be Finer" on its license plates.

Agriculture

Farm commodity relief (H.2312). This would create the "Farm Commodity Relief" Program to be administered by the General Services Division of the Budget and Control Board. The program would do the following:

1. Establish commodity buying stations at Greenville, Florence, Columbia, Charleston, Rock Hill and Aiken.
2. Buy up surplus farm commodities for at least 80% of the market price (as determined by the Department of Agriculture).
3. Use \$20 million in capital bonds to build and run a frozen food and canning facility in Columbia.
4. Have labor provided by inmate volunteers who would receive time off their sentences for time worked and pay a minimum wage to their spouses or dependents.
5. The food would be purchased by state-owned institutions including school districts.
6. Operations would be monitored by an Advisory Commission with one member appointed by the Governor, one from the House and one from the Senate.

Updating the Update
River Basin Map for "Water Resource" Report

In issue number 5 the *Update* published a report on water resources and proposed water resource legislation. The map showing the major river basins in South Carolina was mistakenly omitted. We present it in this issue, with acknowledgements to the South Carolina Water Resources Commission.



Budget Picture: Background

Introduction

The General Appropriation Bill is always the major action taken by the Legislature, and it is often a difficult task. This year a particular combination of circumstances have made the task additionally difficult--and, additionally important. Scott Inkley, Director of Research for the Ways and Means Committee and Budget and Control Board Liaison, has prepared the following report outlining the budget situation. The House Research Office thanks Scott for providing this clear and effective view of the State's budgetary condition.

The Budget Situation

Over the years, hundreds of independent revenue and expenditure decisions have been made, and each was a good and worthy one. All of these separate decisions come together with significant impact in 1985-86 as projected revenues fall short of the projected expenditures. Action must be taken to reduce the projected spending or to increase the revenues, since the State must have a balanced budget.

Background on Revenues

The General Assembly has enacted many revenue reducing exemptions, credits and the like. Both the exemption of a specific group from paying taxes or allowing credits are equivalent to an appropriation of funds, so they are called "tax expenditures." Currently, the State's tax expenditures reduce the general fund by 30% for over \$1.2 billion, which is about half of the total state operating budget.

- A) 100% 3.8 General Fund revenue total--no exemptions, deductions, etc.
30% (1.2) Tax expenditures
70% 2.5 Operating budget
- B) 1.2 Tax expenditures are almost 50% of
2.5 operating budget

Tax expenditures enacted in 1984 cost about \$65 million annually which is over 2% of the projected revenues. These will further annually reduce the general fund by an additional \$15 million in 1985 and \$19.5 million in 1986 because they are phased-in. In three years, the 1984 tax expenditures will cost \$100 million annually, which means that general fund revenues have been reduced substantially from what they would have been.

The indexation of income taxes will cost \$10 million annually at only 4% inflation and compound to cost \$100,000,000 annually in less than ten years. The 95% limitation reserve/capital fund will require an increasing percentage of the revenue growth as it is phased in, and at 95% will continue to reduce available funds at the rate of the revenue growth, just like the general fund reserve does now.

Over time, the general fund revenues have been substantially reduced by tax expenditures, some of which have yet to become fully implemented; all of which will automatically grow in cost over time. Every tax expenditure adopted limits the choices for budget appropriations. If you adopt a tax expenditure then you cannot adopt some budget expenditures, or if you spend it on taxes, then it is not available to spend in the budget.

The General Assembly has five choices: 1) continue the practice of adding tax expenditures and further reducing revenues (the majority of bills in Ways and Means are tax expenditures); 2) stabilize the general fund by adopting very few new tax expenditures; 3) increase existing revenues; 4) raise new revenues; or 5) some combination thereof.

Background on Expenditures

The General Assembly has appropriated funds annually for many good and worthy programs. New programs have been added, old programs expanded, more and more general funds have been used to buy federal funds or replace them. Much of the increased spending was necessary just to maintain the same level of services in the face of inflation. Much of the growth has gone to the entitlement programs that are appropriated by formulas.

An entitlement program is one that gives title to something, provides a "free ticket". Programs that receive annual appropriations based on a formula are entitlements and as such are exempted from the normal budget process. The programs are under no obligation to justify their needs, their efficiency or effectiveness. There are few if any incentives for good management since the increased appropriations are guaranteed each year, regardless of the way the program is managed. Further, formula programs grow based on mathematics, not necessarily based on need. As formulas develop, do they still meet the original intent of the legislature or has the program gotten off the track? The formula funded programs need to be examined for policy reasons, and because there is question about whether the built-in growth can be afforded.

State employees' pay packages must be addressed annually, and a 1% pay increase is heading towards \$8 million in cost. Rate increases for employer contributions (Health and Dental insurance, worker's compensation, retirement, social security) will cost over \$20 million annually. The costs of operating new prisons, health care, education, and other state programs will continue to grow.

These expenditures have been building up over many years and will continue to expand dramatically over time. The costs of this growth have recently been carried by surplus funds, and reserve fund surpluses used for recurring operations, and by deferring payment so that annualization is required later. New programs are started before current programs are adequately funded, and increases are phased in over time.

In 1985-86 the revenues are committed to expenditures by formula, statute or other requirement. The separate decisions of the past combine together so that the projected revenues cannot meet the projected expenditures in 1985-86. There will be no funds for agencies' needs, nor any new programs for the foreseeable future. Even if no surplus is used for recurring expenses, and no funds need annualizing, the formula funded entitlements and the other required increases will not leave enough funds for increases to the 100 other agencies of state government.

The budget process has become self-executing, and there are no decisions or choices left for the legislature. Formulas and other requirements are self-perpetuating, and it is the Budget and Control Board's legal mandate to ensure that they are carried out.

The General Assembly can 1) continue the practice of devising appropriation formulas and other requirements and further limit the budget options for the future; 2) freeze or reduce agency budgets that are not on a formula; 3) modify some of the formulas and requirements; 4) repeal of of the formulas and requirements.

The Budget Problem

Many good independent revenue and expenditure decisions when all added together can have bad consequences. This is the case in FY 1985-86 when projected revenues fall short of projected expenditures. This budget problem must be addressed by raising revenues or reducing expenditures or both.

1985-86 Budget & Control Board Recommended Budget

The Budget and Control Board has recommended repeal or modification of three state laws for the 1985-86 budget. These include:

- 1) full implementation of income tax indexation; the Board recommended implementation at 25% but underfunded it by \$1,062,500;
- 2) the Board recommended the deletion of the food tax credit (\$12.50/taxpayer) which generated \$36 million of additional revenues. However, when the Board of Economic Advisors increased their revenue estimate, the Budget and Control Board recommended the reinstatement of the food rebate utilizing \$20,000,000 of recurring funds and \$15,000,000 of non-recurring funds;

- 3) the limitation on the General Assembly of appropriating no more than 99% of the projected revenues for 1985-86. (The amendment was passed in the House by an 87-0 vote.) The Board recommended that the law go into effect on April 1, 1986, and appropriated 99.75% of the projected revenues, thus saving \$19 million.

The Board recommended spending non-recurring surplus funds for the food rebate (\$15 million), technical education equipment (\$4 million), and school buses (\$15 million), for a total of \$34 million that will have to be annualized in next year's base. Further, the pay increase for state employees was recommended as an 8% merit program funded at 4% or \$31,500,000. This means that next year it will have to be annualized, which when combined with the annualization of non-recurring funds would require \$65 million of the 1986-87 revenue growth.

These recommendations allowed the Board to fully fund the formula programs, most of the critical agency needs, an 8% merit package, and a new indigent care program. However, the recommendations spend more than the Ways and Means Committee has to spend. The Committee has voted to fund the food rebate (\$36 m), not to spend non-recurring funds for recurring expenses (\$19 m), and cannot send to the House an operating budget in excess of 99% of the projected revenues (\$19 m). These three items reduce the revenues available to the Committee by \$74 million.

Ways & Means Committee Response to the 1985-86 Budget

The Ways and Means Committee has struck the Budget and Control Board recommendations, and started over using the current base budget. The Committee has voted to fund:

- A) the food rebate
- B) all recurring items that were funded during FY 1985 out of Part IV (\$26 million)
- C) annualize the 2 week pay delay, the 50% funding of all new positions for this year, and the 2% merit (\$18 million)
- D) statewide rate increases for employee health and dental insurance, retirement, worker's compensation and social security (\$23 million).

The subcommittees have met with the agencies to review their budgets and programs, and to examine their requests for increases. Next, the Committee will review the major formula-funded programs, tax expenditures with automatic growth, and other commitments or limitations that will force the General Assembly to: 1) freeze or cut the budgets of agencies without formulae or 2) modify some of the formulae or 3) raise taxes.

After these issues are discussed, studied, and analyzed, the Committee will decide what action to take. This will determine revenues and commitments, and show how much is available, if any, for the other priorities of state government.

The 1985-86 Budget Picture

The figures below give an overview view of the 1985-86 budget situation. Figures are in millions of dollars.

3,848	Revenue	2,350	Base
(328)	Sales tax exemptions	18	Amunize 84 coats
(955)	Income tax exemptions	26	Annualized Part IV recurring
(36)	Food rebate	23	Rate increase employer contributions
(12)	Indemnation	4	Inventory
(25)	99% limit/reserve	11	Aid to Subdivisions
		40	EPA and schoolbooks
2,492		12	Higher education
	7.6 net increase from Tax Commission	4	TEC
2,499.6	total available	2,488	total required, so--

11.6 available for:
 30-47 State Employees
 30 Agency needs
 500 new programs and unfunded requests

"Hazardous Waste and South Carolina,"

A Summary and Review

Introduction

The problems associated with hazardous waste are especially acute for South Carolina—primarily because our state is one of the prime storage and disposal sites in the entire United States. Over the past several sessions the General Assembly has sought to address the situation; indications are that more efforts will be made in the up-coming legislative year.

In November, 1984, the Bureau of Governmental Research and Services at the University of South Carolina published an issue of its *Public Affairs Bulletin* titled "Hazardous Waste and South Carolina." (Number 27 in the series.) The author, Ann O'M. Bowman is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at USC. For the benefit of House members this *Research Report* summarizes and reviews Professor Bowman's study.

Hazardous Wastes: The Technical Aspect

Hazardous wastes (as opposed to nuclear waste) are unwanted residue of industrial production. They can be hazardous in a number of ways: toxic, corrosive, flammable, or reactive. Dr. Bowman notes that 90% of our nation's hazardous wastes come from a limited number of industries: "organic chemicals, primary metals, plating and polishing, inorganic chemicals, textiles, petroleum refining, rubber and plastics, and agricultural chemicals." (p. 2 of the study) The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that around 150 million metric tons are generated each year (p. 3).

The production of hazardous wastes is the first "technical dimension" to the issue. Production can be adjusted to reduce the amount and hazardous nature of the wastes. Dr. Bowman correctly points out that this option is has the drawback of the large amounts of capital investment required to change plants and facilities. She also points out that many states are trying to keep existing employers and lure new ones--and thus are reluctant to impose additional restrictions.

Treatment of hazardous wastes can reduce their health and environmental dangers. There are three options: physical treatment which removes the contaminating elements through carbon filters, for example; chemical treatment, such as incineration; and biological treatment, which allow micro-organisms to detoxify the waste through such processes as sludge systems, aerated lagoons, and landfarming.

Storage is the phase between creation of the wastes and their disposal. "The difficulty with storage," as Dr. Bowman aptly notes, "is that it can become de facto disposal....What was intended as temporary becomes permanent." (p.3) However, there are some toxic wastes that we don't know how to dispose of at present; these will have to remain "in storage" until the appropriate technology is developed.

Transportation of waste from its point of origin to either storage or disposal sites is a fourth technical issue. The longer the trip, the more chances for accidental spills and leakages. The greater the distance, the higher the cost and danger to the public.

Finally, disposal is the central technical (as well as political and human) concern. How is waste disposed of now? According to the EPA 57% of the waste is disposed of through underground injection--that is, pumping liquid waste deep underground into porous rocks. Another 38% of the waste is in surface storage; 3% is in landfills, and 2% is disposed of in other fashions. (p.4)

Of these methods landfilling is the most controversial. The major fear: leakage of the buried wastes. Leakage can directly affect persons living in the area, or it can pollute underground aquifers and the water they hold.

Hazardous Wastes: Political Fallout

Dr. Bowman emphasizes that technical considerations are only one part of the overall problem. "There are two major political dimensions: intergovernmental relations and public-private sector relations." (p.7)

The federal government has provided some resources in this area through the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the EPA Superfund for cleaning up waste sites. In addition a set of national standards has been developed; the states are expected to see that these standards are followed. Future national involvement may likely be more limited: encouraging research and development of disposal technology and mediating interstate disputes over hazardous waste disposal.

Since Dr. Bowman's study, the U.S. Congress has stiffened the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. New amendments have given the EPA a deadline of no more than 5 years to evaluate the more than 6,000 chemicals now buried in landfills. If the deadline is not met, burial of these chemicals will be prohibited. In addition the number of businesses covered by the law has increased. In the past you had to generate more than 2,200 pounds of waste per month to be covered by RCRA; the figure is now 220 pounds per month. This raises the total of companies covered from 65,000 to 197,000.

Another part of intergovernmental relations involves interstate compacts and agreements on hazardous waste. Few states want such sites, and those who already have them (such as South Carolina) are trying to regulate their incoming loads. And within states local communities have shown themselves adamantly opposed to location of sites in their locales.

Hazardous Wastes in South Carolina

The amount of hazardous wastes in South Carolina is growing at an alarming rate. In 1981 alone the state manufactured 200 million pounds internally; an additional 140 million pounds came in from other states. During 1981, 48.4 million pounds of hazardous waste were treated; 102.6 million pounds were stored; 177.2 million pounds were disposed of. The total: 328.2 million pounds of work. Dr. Bowman ironically states, "South Carolina, needless to say, is considered a relatively 'high waste' site." (p.10)

The southeast has only two federally-approved commercial hazardous waste dumps. One is a 300 acre site in west central Alabama and the other is the 272 acre site in the Pinewood area of Sumter County, South Carolina. The Pinewood facility is a converted kitty litter mine; it holds around 115,000 tons of toxic material, and is a \$14 million dollar a year operation. South Carolina produced 200 million pounds of hazardous waste in 1981. Most of the hazardous waste in the Pinewood site comes from outside the state; North Carolina provides the majority of it--43%; Georgia contributes 23%. Three other southeastern states, Florida, Tennessee and Virginia, make up the bulk of the remainder. Total percentage of out of state waste: 86%.

The site, according to Dr. Bowman's study, is well suited for waste disposal. The soil is highly absorbent and "forms a natural barrier preventing waste migration." (p.13) There has been some concern over possible contamination of nearby Lake Marion or the aquifer. However, the site is designed to divert accidental spills into a collection pond, thus preventing lake pollution, while seepage into the aquifer "seems relatively improbable." (p.13)

Still, the fact remains that any landfill disposal of hazardous waste is potentially dangerous. Certain chemicals, such as PCB and dioxin, are presently banned from the Pinewood site because of their long-lasting and highly dangerous nature. How many other chemicals are equally as dangerous, but not recognized at present? What additional substances should be prohibited from landfills?

A second problem concerns underground storage tanks and their threat of leakage. Gasoline tanks, in particular, have been the object of increasing study. DHEC has recently (December, 1984) proposed regulations for these tanks. This topic will be reported in a future *Research Report*.

Above-ground storage of hazardous wastes is a more clear and present danger, as witness the Bluff Road site in Columbia. In July, 1977, three barrels sitting in pools of rainwater rusted through. A cloud of hydrochloric acid was released. Fifty people had to receive hospital treatment. DHEC moved to force the facility operators to clean up the site; the results were delay and continued unsafe conditions.

Three years later, in 1980, the EPA arrived to conduct tests for chemical contamination. Extensive contamination of the soil, surface water, sedimentation and well water in the area was revealed. The site owners still refused to clean up their act. In the end, the EPA had to place the Bluff Road site on its high priority Superfund list and threaten severe legal action before some generators of the waste agreed to help with its removal. Others are still fighting the issue in court.

Bluff Road was a horror show. The cleanup project manager said it was "the most dangerous dump the cleanup company had encountered in its six-year history." (p.15) Dr. Bowman cites the frightening statistics: "7,500 barrels of poisons, flammable liquids and solids, corrosive liquids, reactives, oxidizers, waste oils, and packages of research laboratory chemicals." (p.15) And, she notes, South Carolina has nine other sites so bad they are on the Superfund list. (See table on the last page of this Report.)

As members of the House are aware, the General Assembly has not been idle on the subject of hazardous wastes. In 1983 a measure was passed that barred hazardous waste from entering South Carolina if that waste was banned in its state of origin. However, the EPA found this statute to be unconstitutional, because it limited interstate commerce, and also disrupted the national EPA hazardous waste policy.

A second measure considered by the Legislature would have imposed relatively stiff taxes on waste to be buried underground, with out-of-state waste being taxed at an even higher rate. Supporters of the tax said it would discourage use of landfills for disposal, and thus reduce the flow of waste into South Carolina. Other observers feared that higher taxes and fees would only lead to more illegal dumping, thus increasing the hazard. Was the RCRA monitoring system adequate to prevent such secret disposal?

An additional argument against the proposal was the difference between in-state and out-of-state taxes and/or fees. Such a discrepancy would be challenged as breaking the interstate commerce provisions of the Constitution.

Finally, the suggestion was made to limit the size of the Pinewood landfill, with a shutdown of the facility once it had reached its limit. The measure died; as Dr. Bowman comments: "perhaps because of the recognition that lessened reliance on the [Pinewood] site could mean increased need for more sites around the state." (p.14).

So, at present, the problems remain, with the state leadership still searching for an elusive solution.

Conclusion

"Hazardous Waste and South Carolina" is a timely and thought-provoking essay on one of the major issues facing the Legislature. Professor Bowman's survey of the topic provides a non-technical yet comprehensive examination of the problem. There is no county in the state unaffected by hazardous wastes, some counties are acutely affected, and our citizens are becoming more concerned over the situation. "Hazardous Waste and South Carolina" is an excellent starting point for further discussion and deliberation over the matter.

House Research Office 1/85/5485

SUPERFUND (NATIONAL PRIORITY LIST) SITES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

<u>Site Name, Location</u>	<u>Conditions</u>	<u>Status</u>
SCRDI,* Bluff Road, Columbia	7,500 barrels of assorted wastes, unsecured storage	Generator-funded cleanup of 75% of site; superfund the rest. Monitoring and remedial work.
SCRDI, Cayce	1,400 barrels of assorted wastes, unsecured storage	Barrels removed; EPA implementing remedial work plan.
Carolawn, Ft. Lawn	1,200 barrels of assorted wastes, 4 large tanks of flammable chemicals,	Surface removal completed. EPA remedial work remains.
Geiger C & M Oil, Rantowles	8 unlined pits hold 35,000 gallons of waste oil, drainage into hardwood swamps and estuaries	EPA developing remedial/feasibility study to be implemented in late 1984.
Independent Nail Co., Beaufort	lead, chromium, cadmium, mercury, and other chemical wastes collected in sewage lagoon	EPA using enforcement powers; working with company to remedy problems.
Kalama Speciality Chemicals, Beaufort	lead, benzene, ethylbenzene, and toluene collected in sewage lagoon	DHEC using enforcement powers and is working with company to remedy problems.
Koppers Company, Florence	contaminated waste lagoon, leakage into wells	company has hired consultants for remedial plan; DHEC involved.
Leonard Chemical Co., Rock Hill	3,400 drums of stored toxic wastes, occasional leaks and spills	DHEC is negotiating with generators for clean up; \$200,000 fund created.
Palmetto Wood Preserving Company, Dixiana	chromium waste contaminating groundwater	EPA using enforcement powers; working with company.
Wachem, Burton	phenols, lead, cadmium, and solvents in leaking waste pit	EPA using enforcement powers; working with company.

* South Carolina Recycling and Disposal, Inc.

Chart taken from "Hazardous Waste and South Carolina," p. 17

Around the House

Black History Month: Sources & Resources

February is Black History month. *Legislative Update & Research Reports* has prepared the following source list of recently published books on various aspects of Black History. Most of the titles here were found in the catalogue *Books in Print*; they should be fairly readily available. Additional titles can be found by consulting your county library or the South Carolina State Library.

One source in particular seems to have an abundance of materials on Black history and culture: The Voter Education Project in Atlanta. Although only one of their publications is listed here there are numerous others which might be of interest to members. The address:

Voter Education Project
52 Fairlie St, NW
Atlanta, GA 30303

Aptheker, Herbert. *Afro-American History: The Modern Era*.
Seacaus (NJ): Citadel Press, 1980.

Bennett, Lerone. *Wade in the Water: Great Moments in Black History*. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Co., 1979.

Berry, Mary Francis. *Long Memory: The Black Experience in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Brimah, Farouk K. *Black Representation at the Federal and State Legislative Levels in the South*. Atlanta: Voter Education Project, 1983.

Bryant, Lawrence. *Negro Lawmakers in the South Carolina Legislature*. Orangeburg: South Carolina State College, 1968.

Cashmore, Ernest. *Black Sportsmen*. New York: Routledge & Kegan, nd.

Dabbs, Edith. *Sea Island Diary: A History of St. Helena Island*. Spartanburg: Reprint Co., 1983.

Foner, Philip. *Essays in Afro-American History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978.

Foner, Philip. *History of Black Americans*. Westport (CT): Greenwood, 1983.

- Foner, Philip. *The Black Worker: A Documentary History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.
- Franklin, John. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans*. 5th edition. New York: Knopf, 1982.
- Gaynell, Catherine. *Three Hundred and Sixty Five Days of Black History*. Cardiff-by-the-Sea (California), 1983.
- Goode, Kenneth. *From Africa to the United States and Then: A Concise Afro-American History*. Cincinnati: Scott, 1976.
- Harding, Vincent. *The Other American Revolution Atlanta: Institute of the Black World*, 1981.
- Harding, Vincent. *There is a River: The Black Struggle for Freedom in America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Holt, Thomas. *Black Over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina During Reconstruction*. Urbana (Ill): Univ. of Ill. Press, 1977.
- Huggins, Nathan (ed). *Key Issues in the Afro-American Experience*. New York: Harcourt-Brace-Johanovich, 1971.
- Johnson, Jesse. *A Pictorial History of the Black Soldier in the U.S. in Peace and War*. Hampton (VA): Hampton Institute, Carver Press, 76.
- Johnson, Jesse. *The Black Soldier*. Hampton (VA): Hampton Institute, Carver Press, 1982.
- Katz, William. *Black People Who Made the Old West*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- King, Anita (compiler). *Quotations in Black*. Westport (CT): Greenwood, 1981.
- Lewis, Samella. *Art: African Americans*. New York: Harcourt-Brace-Johanovich, 1978.
- Litwack, Leon. *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery*. New York: Knopf, 1979; Vintage Books, 1980.
- McFarline, Annjennette. *Black Congressional Orators and their Orations, 1869-1879*. Metuchen (N.J.): Scarecrow Press, 1976.
- Meltzer, Milton. *The Black Americans: A History in Their Own Words*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Newby, I.A. *Black Carolinians: A History of Blacks in South Carolina from 1895 to 1968*. Columbia (SC): University of S. C. Press, 1973.

- Noble, Gil. *Black is the Color of My TV Tube*. New York: Lyly Stuart, 1981.
- Ploski, Harry, and James Williams. *The Afro-American Almanac*. Chicago: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
- Powdermaker, Hortense. *After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South*. Boston: Atheneum, nd.
- Reginald, R. *Free At Last!* San Bernadino (California): Borgo Press, 1984.
- Savage, W. *Blacks in the West*. Westport (CT): Greenwood, 1976.
- Smith, Dwight (ed). *Afro-American History: A Bibliography*. Santa Barbara: Clio Bibliography Series, Number 8, 1981.
- Spangler, Earl. *Blacks in America*. Minneapolis: Lerner, 1980.
- Thomas, James. *From Tennessee SLave to St. Louis Entrepreneur: An Autobiography*. Columbia (Missouri): Univ. of Missouri Press, 1984.
- U.S. Department of Energy: *Black Contributions to Science and Energy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Wynn, Neil. *The Afro-American and the Second World War*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978.